

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/629,884	Applicant(s) GILL, HARDAYAL SINGH	
	Examiner Kevin M. Bernatz	Art Unit 1773	

All Participants:

(1) Kevin M. Bernatz.

(2) David Lynch.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 August 2005

Time: AM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

all

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

all

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the Examiner indicated that the amended subject matter appeared to be unsupported by the as-filed disclosure, but that amendment to claim a barrier layer initially having oxygen and none of the diffusion component, wherein subsequently a diffusion component is diffused into the barrier layer would appear to distinguish over the art of record. The Examiner noted that while this was a process limitation in a product claim, the process results in structure (namely a diffusion gradient) which would not be anticipated or rendered obvious by a process of diffusing elements from the barrier layer to the magnetic layer (i.e. the gradient would be in the opposite direction). In addition, clarification of which properties of the barrier layer are modified by the diffusion component would further distinguish over the art of record, as well as distinguishing over the known contamination of the barrier layer by Mn which is reported in the art (where the Mn diffuses from an antiferromagnetic layer, through a ferromagnetic layer and into the barrier layer). Applicant agreed to the proposed changes..